UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

In This Issue

S. O. LEVINSON

on

The Other Half of Economic Recovery

SYDNEY STRONG

on

The Power of Control at Geneva

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 7

Chicago, April 18, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 99
The Modern Bible—ALSON H. ROBINSON 101
Jottings—J. H. H. 102

ARTICLES—
For the Living—*James Lane Allen* 99
Imperial Logic—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 102
The Other Half of Economic Recovery—S. O. LEVINSON 103
Power of Control at Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG 105
"Discourses on Religion Addressed to the Educated Among Its Despisers"—PERCY M. DAWSON 107

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Jewish Elmer Gantry—NATHAN ESSELL 109

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Personal Letter from India—N. 110

THE FIELD—
Laski on Coercion in India 98

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Laski on Coercion in India

[We publish herewith a remarkable address spoken recently in England, at a meeting of the India League, by Professor Harold J. Laski, one of the most brilliant of English economists and scholars. Others who spoke with him at this meeting were Bertrand Russell and George Lansbury.—EDITOR.]

The time has come when every Englishman who cares for freedom has the moral obligation to bear his own witness. What we are seeing in India today is no new spectacle, either in our own history or that of every imperialist people. Nothing is easier than the insistence upon domination when power is in your own hands, and I want to examine the habits of the British Government since the return of Mr. Gandhi to India from three simple points of view.

1. When Mr. Gandhi went back to India there was no person who had close and continual association with him but who was aware of his anxiety for peace. There is no one who worked with him but who knew of his ardent anxiety to continue the efforts for co-operation. He was more anxious for co-operation, more fearful lest it should break down than, perhaps, under the grim circumstances of past experience he was entitled to be. But none of us who saw Mr. Gandhi at close quarters can but bear witness to the reality of his convictions that he would walk to the very end of the road for peace if it could be had. He was encouraged to do that not merely by wicked socialists upon whom later the country was to pass its verdict, but by men not to be suspected of socialism, like the Secretary of State for India and Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald. It is, I think, important that we should realize how profound that encouragement was. I wish I could stand face to face at a Round Table Conference on India with Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and ask him some questions. I should like to ask him whether he said or did not say on the night before Gandhi sailed for home that he should go to Bengal himself and examine the whole situation there and on the basis of that examination he should go to the Viceroy and tell him what he thought the wisest measures to take to deal with the difficulties. I should like to ask Mr. Ramsay MacDonald whether, when he was visited by Sapru and Jayakar and their friends, they did not put before him amendments to the Bengal Ordinance, which they knew would make co-operation with Gandhi far easier; whether MacDonald himself was not impressed by these amendments and urged that they should be communicated to the Viceroy; and I wish MacDonald would tell us frankly whether at the time when the Bengal Ordinances were promulgated, he had not and was not known to have a sense of shame about their contents; whether it was not his view that their amend-

(*Continued on page* 111)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1932 Number 7

FOR THE LIVING

"You remember the woman who broke the alabaster box for the feet of the Savior while he was living—that most beautiful of all the appreciations? And you know what we do? Let our fellow-beings carry their crosses to their Calvary, and after each has suffered his agony and entered into his peace, we go out to him and break our alabaster boxes above his stiff cold feet. I have always hoped that my religion might enable me to break my alabaster box for the living who alone can need it—and who always do need it."

—*James Lane Allen,* **in "The Choir Invisible."**

Gandhi has an unshakeable trust in justice and truth, and in time as the friend of both. To many far less patient persons it is incredible that the Mahatma can be so serene in the face of multiplying difficulties. But he is unperturbed because he understands the forces of right that are working on his side, and is willing to give them time to produce their results. How frequently and effectively he is justified, is shown anew by the recent action of the Moslem Congress in India. Persistently we have been told that the 70,000,000 followers of Mohammed in India are opposed to Gandhi, and are staunch supporters of the Crown. But if this is the case, how has it happened that Britain has now been defeated in holding the allegiance of these faithful subjects? British diplomatists are not usually outwitted in this fashion. As a matter of fact, of course, there has never been any such alienation between Hindus and Moslems as English propagandists have represented. Moslem politicians, like other politicians, especially leaders of a minority group, have been glad to take advantage of a tangled situation to further their group ends. But at bottom these politicians have always had to count upon a popular sentiment strongly set in favor of *Swaraj* and in support of India's great champion of *Swaraj,* Mahatma Gandhi. Now, characteristically without warning so far as the newspapers are concerned, the Moslem Congress has refused further cooperation with the British Round Table conferees, has laid down extraordinary demands for British recognition, and has taken the first steps in preparation for a non-violent campaign of resistance against the *Raj*. This is a terrific blow to Britain—the dispersal into thin air of all the elaborate conspiracy for the feud of Moslems against their own nationalist cause. Meanwhile we think of Gandhi sitting quietly in his prison-cell, spinning his *Khaddar* like the thread of fate which binds the destinies of men and nations.

Governor Roosevelt is growing rapidly stronger in the country at large, and at the same time steadily weaker in his own state. This contradiction has its origin in the political conflict in the Governor's own heart, which is reflected in the conflict of public interest which embarrasses him. On the one hand, to secure the presidential nomination, he needs, or thinks he needs, the support of Tammany Hall. On the other hand, the ignominy and scandal of the Hall are being widely revealed day after day in the Seabury investigation, and thus flinging a challenge at Albany which must be answered. To plunge into the clean-up campaign in New York City and thus abandon Tammany, is almost certain to cost Mr. Roosevelt the support of his state in the Democratic Convention, and thus perhaps the nomination itself. But to evade the consequence of the Seabury inquiry, and thus to forfeit leadership of the reform forces in the metropolis, is certain to cost him the allegiance of Democrats west of the Hudson, to whom Tammany is anathema. The distraction which this predicament is occasioning the Governor was made manifest by his recent letter of fierce attack upon John Haynes Holmes and Stephen S. Wise, Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively of the City Affairs Committee, for their demand for the removal from office of Tammany officials proved to be corrupt by the investigations of the Hofstadter Committee. It is something of a spectacle when the Governor of a great state, avowedly a candidate for the national presidency, with high claims to intelligence and character, goes out of his way to wax wroth not against those responsible for vile conditions in New York, but rather against those striving to correct these conditions. What we see in Mr. Roosevelt is the familiar and always pathetic spectacle of a not unworthy man going steadily and swiftly to pieces morally under the disintegrative influence of ambition for high public office. The New York Governor had a predecessor who was immune to this influence. Grover Cleveland! But Franklin K. Roosevelt is made of different stuff.

It is high time that a Senate committee went to Kentucky and inquired if the Constitution is still in

vogue in that state. The recent expedition of the New York students revealed clearly what had been more or less manifest for weeks, that the issue in Harlan County is no longer merely an issue of labor conditions and wages, but is now become a basic issue of the rights of men in a democracy. Of course at bottom, in these mining regions of Kentucky, is an impossible economic situation. The bituminous industry has lost its old market, is crippled and disorganized, and simply cannot support the labor population dependent upon it. Here, as in England, is an industry in process of disintegration and collapse, and, under our chaotic system of so-called capitalistic organization, utterly helpless to make adaptation. Unable to work, or to move elsewhere to find other work, the Harlan miners and their families have simply starved, and latterly reached the end of their endurance. All intertwined with this situation are the usual factors characteristic of company mining—low wages, bad conditions of labor, company houses, company stores, company "money," and so on. The condition of employment in these Kentucky mining areas is simply a form of industrial serfdom, incredible in this age and place. In the inevitable revolt, has come the old issue of civil liberties. The government, owned and controlled by the coal operators, is of course only a weapon in the fight against the miners. The most lawless and brutal type of sheriff rule has taken the place of constitution and statutes and courts, and a population, terrorized as well as starving, is held in helpless subjection. And now this population is cut off from relief, for no unauthorized individual can enter the County, convey food, consult with counsel, investigate and speak, or exercise any other liberty supposedly guaranteed to American citizens. Government in Kentucky today is worse than anything known in Mussolini's Italy. Yes, it is high time a Senate committee journeyed to this land of tyranny and terror.

The April issue of the *Crisis* contains a remarkable symposium on Communism by a group of distinguished Negro editors. With practical unanimity these editors declare that there is a steady drift of the Negroes in this country toward Communism, and they more or less justify this tendency. "The Communists appear to be the only party going our way," writes Mr. Carl Murphy, editor of the *Afro-American,* Maryland. "We do not think (Communism) offers the way out for the Negro," states Mr. P. B. Young, editor of the Norfolk (Va.) *Journal and Guide,* but "the Communists in America have commendably contended for . . . equality of all races, and have . . . accepted Negroes into their ranks in both high and lowly positions." "Whether for better or for worse," says Mr. E. Washington Rhodes, editor of the Philadelphia (Pa.) *Tribune,* "thousands of Negroes are playing with the Communists . . . I am told that there are more dark-skinned than white Communists in Philadelphia." "Negroes may be expected," argues Mr. J. Alston Atkins, editor of the Houston (Texas) *Informer and Texas Freeman,* "to be lured by Communism and every other name that holds out to them bright hopes for relief from their burdens. . . . Nor will Negro leaders who themselves have no program . . . be able to stem this tide." The explanation of this situation is not far to seek, and is boldly set forth by these editors. The Negroes in America are an oppressed people—their oppression is making them more and more self-conscious as a group, and more and more eager to turn to any movement that offers them release. Says Mr. William M. Kelley, editor of the Amsterdam (N. Y.) *News,* referring to his people as "oppressed on every hand, denied equal educational facilities, discriminated against in public places, and in employment, Jim-Crowed on street cars and railroad trains, imprisoned for long terms without due process of law and even lynched, it would seem that any program, Communistic or Socialistic . . . should readily find converts among American Negroes." If the black man turns "red," in other words, it will be the white Americans who will be to blame. Certainly if these Americans fear Communism and would stop its spread, it would seem to be wise for them to practise a little justice and goodwill.

The George Washington Bi-Centenary, we are informed, is a great boon to these bad times. Which is as frank a confession of our American use of such occasions for purely commercial purposes, as we have ever seen! The money-making side, or chief end, of the Washington celebration in New York is utterly undisguised. Mt. Vernon replicas are built, souvenir programs printed, public pageants planned, all for the profit there is in them. George Washington, in other words, can be turned into a circus for bringing people to the metropolis and inducing them to spend money, and the chance is not going to be lost. All of which suggests the wisdom of organizing these centennial anniversaries, to the end of having them come at the times when they may be needed most! Thus, we must see to it that the one hundredth or two hundredth celebration of the birth or the death of a great man always arrives in the midst of a business depression. Or, since anniversary dates cannot be easily shifted, shall we not plan our cycles of depression, so that each recurring industrial collapse synchronizes with some great historical occasion? Here, for example, in 1939, comes the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as the first president of the United States! Why not fix our next stock crash and panic for that year? But this may be too soon—we shall hardly be over the present depression by that time! In this case, let us recall that the im-

mortal George died in 1799, and that 1949, therefore, will make the century-and-a-half celebration of this occasion. This allows for just about the right interval —another period of bad times will surely be due that year. Let us fix it so, and thus arrange to have the dark days brightened by the anniversary of Washington's death as now they are being brightened by the anniversary of his birth. Nor need we limit ourselves to the great Virginian! There are other great men, battles, peaces—plenty of things to commemorate. All we need is a system, and the historical anniversary and the commercial depression will always come together. Most respectfully we urge the appointment of a government commission to study this matter and arrange an appropriate schedule.

Society, especially as it has manifested itself in organized government, has always had great difficulty in distinguishing between saints and sinners. From Jeremiah and Socrates, not to go any farther back, all the men whom history has canonized as martyrs have been thus glorified because in their day they were put in jail or slain on the block as criminals or even traitors. Contemporary society has not been able, or willing, to see in these men the qualities which posterity has recognized as giving them a rating not with the sinners but with the saints. It is pathetic to note the men who have been doomed to confusion in our day. Thus, in the century back of this year 1931, few men were more surely in the doubtful class than Abraham Lincoln. Since his time, and easily within the memory of many now living, there have been Henry George, Gene Debs, John P. Altgeld, Robert M. LaFollette, Sacco and Vanzetti, about whom the public mind is still in a sad case of ignorance and prejudice. Mahatma Gandhi is only the latest of the long line. Or shall we name as this latest example Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh, who is denied citizenship by the Supreme Court, while "Al" Capone can be convicted only of a crime which was a mere by-product (probably) of his major offences against the social order? By what strange moral strabismus is it that men are thus blinded? Why is Barabbas so often preferred for release to Jesus? History, however, is not fooled. It has an interesting way of bringing true the words, "With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

The Modern Bible

The world's best seller has appeared in a new edition. It would be a long story to tell of the innumerable versions and editions through which the Bible has passed from the earliest writings of the 12th century before Christ to the present year. The compilation of the Old Testament covered a period of about one thousand years, ending with its translation into Greek in the year 200 B. C. Manuscripts of these original writings are very rare, and comparatively modern.

The oldest Hebrew manuscripts that we possess go back only to the year 1009 A. D., and were formerly preserved in the Imperial Library in Leningrad. The oldest Greek manuscript of the Bible at our disposal dates from the 4th century A. D. In other words, the Old Testament was subject to a process of change for more than two thousand years, and the New Testament for two hundred years, before we come to those documents which modern scholars can adopt as a basis of translation into the English language. However, one may regard the infallibility of the Bible as an instrument of God's word, it is hard to get away from the undeniable fact that it has been subject to the influence of human error, ignorance, and prejudice for many centuries.

Following Wycliffe's translation in the 14th century, the three great landmarks of the English versions are: The King James Version of 1611, The Revised Version of 1885, and the American Standard Revision of 1901. The most recent fruit of scholarship in this field has just appeared under the title "The Bible, An American Translation," by J. M. Powis Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed of the University of Chicago. Both of these men are scholars of the highest rank. They are familiar with the historical and archeological discoveries of the past few years, which throw new light upon the language and meaning of the ancient scriptures. This translation embodies the results of these discoveries, and wherever this rendering suggests a new meaning, the chances are that this most recent translation is correct, and former translations at least inadequate.

But most important of all is the language in which this new version is cast. Here at last is a Bible free from the archaic vocabulary of 17th century England; vibrant with the language of 20th century America. Where the King James Version reads, "He restores my soul," the American Bible reads, "He gives me new life." In place of the familiar song of the shepherds, one reads, "Glory to God in heaven, and on earth. Peace to the men he favors." "Charity suffereth long and is kind" becomes "Love is patient and kind. Love is not envious; it does not put on airs."

It is hardly to be expected that this, or any, new translation of the Bible will meet immediate or widespread approval. The King James Version sounds better, is associated with liturgical worship, and repre-

sents an unusually pure example of classic English prose. But of course little of the Bible was intended originally to be read in Church, and as for English literature, there are plenty of other writings just as good.

To an increasing number of people the importance of the Bible lies not in its intrinsic qualities, but in the historic role it has played in conditioning the development of religion and conduct throughout the progress of western civilization. As the supernatural qualities which have been attributed to it gradually disappear, and they certainly will, its true merit and function will be more clearly seen. This new translation, in language which everybody can understand, may in time do much to establish its true meaning and importance to this generation.

Up to the 16th century it was believed that wide circulation or understanding of the Bible was undesirable. And one great branch of the Christian Church today still retains that position. Among others, John Colet, one of the great English reformers, thought differently. Speaking of his desire that the sacred scriptures should be read by private individuals, Colet said, "I wish that the husbandman may sing parts of them at his plow; that the weaver may warble them at his shuttle; that the traveller may with their narratives beguile the weariness of the way."

It is a far cry in agriculture, industry, and travel from Colet's day to our own, but perhaps it is not difficult to believe that he might give hearty approval to this latest effort to make these same scriptures better known upon this continent, which in his day had barely been discovered.

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

Jottings

It takes light and darkness to make up the firmament. In the same way, it takes Brandeis and Sutherland to make up the Supreme Court.

Well, well! There is civilization in Mussolini's Italy, after all. The refusal to elect Giovanni Papini to the Royal Academy of Italy is enough to prove the culture and enlightenment of any country.

Vici Baum, author of "Grand Hotel," has come to this country to be naturalized as an American citizen. She says that she likes American men—they are so boyish, and never worry. *Never worry!* Miss Baum has evidently been away from these shores since 1929.

Mr. Hoover has asked Americans to buy automobiles, and thus help a great industry. Will the President please tell us with what!

The New York Telephone Company has given $233,413 to charity during the last three years, and has charged up the donation to "operating expenses." This, of course, keeps down profits, and thus fools the public as to rates for service. Evidently, charity is beginning at home again!

DEFINITION: (9) *Political Candidate*—the figurehead of a pirate ship.

J. H. H.

Imperial Logic

[From our Special Correspondent]

We are a Ruling Race because of our Natural Superiority, which is obvious because we are a Ruling Race.

Our Country is always in The Right because it always says so; and what it says must be true, because Our Country is always in The Right.

We believe in Freedom for others to do what we approve of; for Freedom is a British Commodity, and anything we do not approve of is Foreign Freedom, which cannot be True Freedom. (Copyright reserved.)

We need colonies because of our expanding population, which we need to man the guns to defend our colonies.

We need an expanding population for purposes of War in defending our colonial possessions necessitated by an expanding population.

Occupy Gibraltar, Malta and Aden as coaling stations for the fleet to defend Aden, Malta and Gibraltar.

Now we must fight to defend our Empire that we may be economically self-sufficient in case of War.

The Indians cannot have Democracy because they are unfit for self-government, since they have never had Democracy, being unfit for self-government (never having had Democracy).

It is undemocratic for Indians (says Mr. MacDonald) to assert themselves against the authority of British Democracy.

They cannot have independence because we have no proof that they want it, since they have no means of demanding it, not being independent.

So we must shoot Indians to maintain our authority to shoot Indians to maintain our authority to prevent them from fighting among themselves.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

The Other Half of Economic Recovery

I.

Our baffling domestic problems have now been effectively grappled with by great and unprecedented mechanisms of support and relief set up under the leadership of President Hoover by prompt and decisive action of Congress. The loyal cooperation between both political parties for the economic salvation of our Country is the type of nationalism that is heart-warming and beyond praise. But economic conditions have been so demoralized, unreasoning fear has so undermined public sentiment that every avenue of aid and improvement, domestic and foreign, should be explored with a view to the relief of our own people, and consistently therewith, of other peoples as well.

It seems timely, therefore, to reconsider the acute international questions in which the United States is heavily interested. Financial complications resulting from our entry into the war, our governmental loans and credits to the Allies during and immediately after the war, and the efforts of American and European bankers to aid in post-war European recovery have, together with the burning question of German reparations, produced perhaps the greatest and most vexing economic problem of all times. Whether the United States should have entered the war, whether we should have made the huge loans to the Allies, whether the post-war loans by banking institutions were or were not justified, it is now altogether too late and obviously fruitless to discuss. The second "war panic" now raging in its third year, has brought about a world economic debacle in whose toils our Country has been almost inextricably caught. Should we not, in our own as well as in world interest, complete the work of economic recovery by promoting an equitable liquidation of the war inheritances now plaguing mankind? This Republic, born of European stock, while rightly steering clear of military and political commitments, is in a powerful position to aid in the appeasement and stabilization of Europe, with manifest advantages to ourselves, provided Europe is now ready and willing to make the changes and contributions indispensable to that end.

The proposed plan is based squarely on the assumption that sound American public opinion will support, yes rejoice over, the consummation of a just plan, to which all interested nations and parties are required to make substantial contributions—a plan that will equitably lighten the after-burdens of the war, reconcile the nations of Europe, drastically reduce the staggering costs of armaments, revive for our farmers and manufacturers a normal foreign market, and make possible a return of prosperity and an era of genuine peace.

In the past ten years many laudable efforts have been made, and some plans adopted, "to liquidate the war." While they have been valuable as emergency expedients, as temporary bridges over crises, no comprehensive program purporting to cover the critical phases of the situation has been considered. It is coming to be almost universally recognized that partial plans, piecemeal adjustments, temporizing mechanisms, do not reach the heart of the problem. The proposed Plan, following the analogy of a business reorganization, seeks to take account of the most accurate international factors, and to do substantial justice to all interested nations without unduly shifting the burden to the American people. We are confronted with a tangled problem, directly resulting from the vast and unprecedented economic waste of the world war, intensified by the actual or potential bankruptcy of most of the nations involved. A business reorganization is occasioned by an excess of debts. But for the inability of a corporation to meet its matured and maturing indebtedness, no reorganization would be necessary. Hence, it is obvious that no sound reorganization can take place unless there is an adequate reduction of indebtedness—the crux of the situation. But all interests, not merely one, should join in making concessions and sacrifices for the common benefit of all.

Whether or not there is a legal relationship (in law called *privity*) between reparations and debts is immaterial. For either way we would face the same practical problem to be solved by the business method of rational adjustments. But certainly reparations and debts had a common origin, both arose from the cauldron of the world war. The real question is, therefore, what is the best solution of this perplexing problem? For upon its solution the other half of our hopes of early economic recovery depends. The proposal herein contained is respectfully offered in the hope that it may help to remove the storm clouds of our depression and to restore the sunlight of developing prosperity.

II.

The proposed plan is as follows:

1. Procure for the United States, in final readjustment of the Allied debts owing us, a total aggregate cash settlement amounting to a little over 4 billion dollars as follows:

Cash already received from the Allies up to the moratorium of June 20, 1931 (Report of our Secretary of the Treasury for 1931, page 551)	$2,615,000,000
Additional cash to be received from the Allies under proposed plan, $1,400,000,000 at the flat rate of $100,000,000 a year for 14 years, commencing December 15, 1932	1,400,000,000
Total cash payment of Allies to United States	$4,015,000,000

As the original principal of these debts was about 10 billion dollars, the United States would thus receive 40% thereof, or, if computed on the principal as reduced in our 1923-28 debts settlements, we would be receiving about 60% thereof.

2. In addition the United States to receive 70 million dollars in cash, payable 5 million dollars a year for 14 years commencing December 15, 1932. in full settlement of the unpaid balance owing on our Army of Occupation costs and the mixed claims governmental award of 42 million dollars (both these are direct German obligations) $70,000,000

This makes a grand total in cash to the United States $4,085,000,000

3. All old disputed and vexatious claims in foreign nations, against the United States, or its constituent states, especially those asserted by British subjects against some of our Southern States, to be abandoned and cancelled.

4. All inter-Allied European debts, the original principal of which was about 7 billion dollars (mostly owing to Great Britain by her European Allies) to be cancelled and released. Among these debtors to Great Britain are France, Italy, Belgium, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, JugoSlavia, Poland, Greece, Lithuania, Finland, Esthonia and Latvia. These with Great Britain constitute our main Allied debtors.

5. German reparation payments to the Allies to be reduced from their present annual level of 413 million dollars (including both conditional and unconditional payments) to 150 million dollars annually, payable unconditionally, that is, in gold. The period of reparation payments to be limited to fourteen annual flat installments of 150 million dollars each, commencing December 15, 1932, making a total additional

reparation payment by Germany of 2 billion 100 million dollars. Payments to be made to and through the Bank for International Settlements. This would yield the Allies, after paying the United States 100 million dollars annually, a balance of 50 million dollars a year in reparations for 14 years for distribution among themselves, or a total of 700 million dollars.

6. In addition Germany to pay principal, interest and sinking funds on her outstanding Dawes and Young bond issues, originally 210 million dollars and 300 million dollars respectively, subject to interest and sinking fund modifications in sections 7 and 8.

7. Reduction in the annual rate of interest by the holders of all Germany's external commercial bonds and notes (including bankers' and investors' loans, governmental, municipal and industrial loans and also the Dawes and Young Plan bonds) from their pre-moratorium general average of about 8% per annum to 5½%, the latter being the rate on the comparatively recent Young Plan loan of 300 million dollars. The Dawes bonds bear 7% interest. As Germany at 8% has been paying a total of 460 million dollars interest annually on the foregoing external debts, a reduction to 5½% would mean a saving to her in gold payments of about 145 million dollars a year. Thus transfer payments by Germany on future reparations of 150 million dollars annually as provided herein would substantially be made available, and the nightmare of German defaults and consequent political and economic chaos would be removed. British, French, American, Dutch and Swiss banks and bankers handled these external German loans, and they and their respective nationals are now the holders of these bonds and notes.

8. Defer and omit sinking fund or amortization payments on all the above external German loans including the Dawes and Young bonds, for a period of three years, same to be resumed thereafter. This will furnish a much-needed breathing spell and should make unnecessary any further moratorium for that purpose.

9. A general plan of equitable, progressive but drastic disarmament to be evolved and accepted by the nations at the present Geneva Disarmament Conference, both to promote world peace and to effect enormous financial savings by all nations now so vitally needed. The world has been spending 10 million dollars a day (4 billion dollars a year) the past few years for peace time armaments. If, by the ingenuity of common sense, the nations now meeting at Geneva would agree to a progressive pro rata cut of 50% of their armaments (with safeguards against unfair results) the world would save from economic waste 2 billion dollars a year or 5 million dollars a day. The United States would thereby save 350 million dollars a year indefinitely, and Europe the sum of 1200 million dollars a year indefinitely. Here economic necessity and world peace make a joint and irresistible appeal and here too we can find abundant compensation in money for our further reduction of Allied debts.

10. The Treaty of Versailles to be reasonably revised to conform to the spirit and purpose of the proposed readjustment in order to bring about political appeasement and amity among European nations. Without these concomitants the results may be barren and the sacrifices vain. This work is strictly European and mainly Franco-German.

11. In view of the great relief from present conditions afforded Germany under this plan, and doubly to insure her permanent acceptance thereof, a legal plebiscite to be held in Germany ratifying the entire program of readjustment, thereby binding the present and future German governments to its validity and permanence regardless of political changes hereafter in the Reich. As all political groups in Germany have emphasized their willingness to pay the external commercial debts as they now stand, the affirmative vote in such referendum should be well nigh unanimous.

III.

The foregoing plan largely explains itself. If it did not furnish adequate relief to Germany, it should adorn the wastebasket. The theory in this respect has been to make Germany pay not "the most she can" but "the least she must" to accomplish an equitable liquidation of the war mess. The plan attempts to disentangle and simplify the snarl of international war debts and to reduce them all to a point of moderation and assured payment. It requires American and foreign bankers and their clients to contribute 145 million dollars a year by a reduction of the interest rate on German bonds and notes to 5½%. The original average rate of 8% doubtless took its cue from the high rates of interest that have prevailed inside Germany for many years. But it is safe to forecast that a sound 5½% German bond will command a materially higher price in the financial markets of the world than a precarious 8% German bond now does. That is an example of what is meant in reorganizations when it is said that all interests should make concessions for the common benefit of all.

The United States is apparently making the greatest sacrifice in the proposed program. But in reality the sacrifice was largely made years ago and with our eyes open. We voluntarily entered the war with great enthusiasm shared by the writer and his two soldier sons. Our government spent 38 billion dollars in the nineteen months we were in the war. We asked nothing and took nothing from the peace table in 1919, while we watched all the others revel in the spoils of war. We made highly doubtful investments in the form of war loans and credits to the Allies aggregating 10 billion dollars. Here is a staggering total governmental war investment of 48 billion dollars. I ask in all sincerity: When did we really lose this money; was it when we expended and loaned it; was it when we refused to share in the spoils of war; or would it be now when we are trying to set the broken world on its feet by accepting forty cents on the dollar of the original loans from nations whose "capacity to pay" in common with our own has enormously declined? It is clear that we are making no attempt to get back any of our other 38 billion dollars, which is 80% of it all. For otherwise we would have insisted on sharing in the spoils of the war, reparations and all. Thus it is now only a question of how much we can save out of the remaining 20% of our war investment. The proposed plan would yield us a total of 40% thereof, or 4 billion dollars. Do not the manifold advantages of such a settlement entirely outweigh the possibilities of ultimately getting more out of this remnant of our war investment?

The United States alone among the nations long ago renounced the spoils of war. It was President McKinley who, over thirty years ago, first announced that thereafter the United States would not partake of the fruits of conquest or war-victory. President Wilson made a similar pronouncement when we entered the world war. There is also the magnanimous action of our government in returning to China our share of the indemnity in the Boxer uprising. And, as a climax, in the world war we refused to accept any part of the spoils of war whether called reparations, damages, or annexations, although our associate nations dipped their hands deep in all these traditional perquisites of successful warfare. We have not based our action in these war situations on technical or legal grounds and it would be in keeping with our great record of restraint and unselfishness to promote and help carry out a general settlement and rehabilitation, a program promoting friendship and contentment among the people of Europe which might belatedly bring about the kind of world envisioned by President Wilson and by the American people in their 1918 dream of peace for which they had fought. Have the statesmen of Europe and the responsible officials of their governments the courage and the vision not only to join in this move-

ment, but themselves to lead it? If they have, then the recent significant words of Senator Borah may become historically prophetic: "I predict that if such a program were inaugurated in Europe, it would strike an immediate response in the hearts of our people."

But no halfway measures will serve; no mere patchwork plans of temporary dimensions must be considered. We must have a comprehensive settlement that will give a new lease of life to countless millions of the world's peoples. How long is the penal servitude of the war to last? And pray, who are really paying its crushing penalties? They are being paid by the innocent common people of every nation of the earth. As has been truly said, the allied and associated powers won the war but lost the peace. It is poor consolation to say that the Central Powers lost both. I appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, from the conduct of war-mad nations to their sober sense of forgiveness, justice and peace. I appeal to Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Poland and the other Allies to put an end to the economic and political chaos resulting from the war and to form a solid European phalanx for that purpose. I make especial appeal to the spiritual quality of the great French people whose name is imperishably attached to the creation and life of a democracy, to apply their noble emblem of "liberty, quality and fraternity," so effective within their nation, to all their international relationships. Europe thinks America is the stumblingblock to economic appeasement; America thinks France is largely its stumblingblock. As our two democracies were born of brave revolutions, as the treaty renouncing and outlawing war bears at its masthead the names of a French and an American statesman, so I fervently hope that the "better angels" of both our peoples will join in leading the world out of the morass of international ill-will, injustice and oppression, into the fertile fields of "equality and fraternity" where God reigns and the blessings of peace may triumph.

S. O. Levinson.

Power of Control at Geneva

[From Our Special Correspondent]

I have been trying now for some time to locate the power of control at Geneva. I had heard that the French were "running the show," and were often troublesome. I was mistaken. The British have chief control. They own at least "51% of the stock," of the League of Nations. Let me state some facts, without comment—with a mind as unbiased I trust as Luther's when he went to Rome.

1. Take the Secretariat, with its five hundred or so employees. It is the machinery of the League, which will soon be housed in a palace, partly built by Rockefeller money. Over sixty per cent of the best paid half of the employees are British. The head of the very important Press section is British. The Secretary-General Drummond is British, and he is *permanent*. Drummond is equal to the whole managing-board, when it comes to control. I question if anything important could get through the League, without his approval. He was born with the League, and has been intimate Secretary for Balfour. He is right on the spot, and never hesitates to assume control in emergencies. He always sits next to the chairman of all meetings—be they Council, Assemblies or Conferences.

2. Take the Council—the control-board of the League. It is the "House of Lords." Theoretically, it is in session continuously. It is composed of fourteen delegates, representing as many nations. Five so-called Big Powers—Britain, France, Japan, Germany, Italy—have *permanent* and front seats. The other nine serve each for three years and then pass out from control, giving place to other minor powers. The nine are chosen by the Assembly. The Council is the business-end of the League, and even all acts of the Assembly must be okayed by the Council. The Council holds the purse strings, and must okay even the expenses of the excellent "Labor" annex—popularly known as B. I. T.

I have spent hours watching the Council operate, sitting within fifty feet of the Horseshoe Table, where the delegates confer. I have many times witnessed the Japan-China tragedy. I have had considerable experience observing politicians and ecclesiastics, in many lands, since first I saw red-coats in Egypt in 1885, and Turks in Palestine. I sharpened my faculties to observe the actors in the invasion of Manchuria and Shanghai, as portrayed before the Council of League. I have studied Sato of Japan week after week as he hesitated, delayed and excused, while Japan's army was daily advancing. I have weighed his voice, his physiognomy, as well as his words. In like manner, I have watched Yen of China, his frankness in voice and words, urgently calling the attention of the Council to the advancing troops of Japan. I was present the evening, when Yen, pointing to the clock, said, "In three hours the bombing of Shanghai will begin." In all of these meetings, the delegates did little more than mumble. They listened more attentively to the voice of Japan, whose delegate for ten years had sat as a permanent member at that table, and right next to Britain's delegate.

After China and Japan had presented their cases, the chair would sum up and call upon the delegates to express their minds. I noted that Britain enjoyed the right of primogeniture, and so was always first to speak. I noted that Britain exercised this "first-born" son's right of leading discussions—were it at the opening of the Disarmament Conference, the Assembly or in the Council. After the Disarmament Conference got well under way, in organization, it sounded quite natural to hear President Henderson, British, say, "The discussion will now be opened by Sir John Simon." My remarks so far carry no comment. I am looking for the chief power of control in the League. It is British.

3. Peace Propaganda at Geneva is largely under British control. Again, I am seeking facts, and not yet making comment. The most ambitious program of peace people is known as the Budapest plan, that took shape much over a year ago, by the League of Nations Unions of many lands. It formed the basis of discussions at the Paris Conference, last November. It is largely British-made, with Robert Cecil as head of the movement to get it before the Disarmament Conference, for favorable consideration. A number of peace groups in America are acting under initiative

coming from promoters of this plan. This extends clear down to organization of the local social and religious forces, and to supplying information for the press, and even to influencing the American delegation to the Conference. While the British are a trifle over ambitious in exercising the principle of primogeniture, in securing chairmenships, etc.—yet, they should be given the credit for their activities, while others are doing little.

When I ask myself what is it that the Britsh peace people are after, I should say that they are willing to go far, if others do also, but never so far as comparatively to weaken themselves. Further, they are aiming hard to secure the formation of a Permanent Disarmament Commission, which in my judgment does not promise well for world peace. There is still too much power located in the hands of a few big nations. Here too Britain would possess chief control. If a Permanent Disarmament Commission should come out of the Conference, it will mean a Pax Britannica for a score of years. This might be a good thing for the world, but it is best to know what we are getting, when it is handed to us.

4. The Far East Situation. Here again, the British are seen in possession of the chief power of control, so far as the Western nations are concerned. For four months I watched the Council of the League. At times, I thought it was real tragedy, again that the delegates were only playing in a grim farce. It seemed to me that if Britain's delegate had only spoken strong words of protest against Japan's invasion, Japan would have heeded. But, it failed to come, day after day, week after week! Then, came America's protest. The Council seemed to arouse itself, listened to China's cry. Called the Assembly. Meanwhile, America was bearing the irritation in the situation, while the nations on the Council were still hesitant. They seemed to fear to offend their old comrade on the Council—Japan.

The Assembly has at last spoken well, but Japan is now secure in possession! America has been moved into bearing the brunt of the opposition to Japan, and coming nearer to the danger line of war than the Big Powers of Europe. A Commission of nineteen will now seek to solve the problem. Of these, twelve are regular members of the Council of the League. If the Council played a game of procrastination from September to March, it may be queried, what will the same men plus five other new men accomplish?

And, it is well to note, in order to locate the power of control, that it is the British Ambassador in Shanghai who is chairman, a British Admiral in Shanghai, who calls the other admirals together and reports to the League, that Britain heads the Commission to Manchuria. Britain's influence will dominate in the settlement of Far Eastern affairs. What will it be? A swift consolidation of China's life in national integrity, or an encouragement of political weakness, when Japan may secure a foothold in Manchuria and the Shanghai region? Will Britain play with Japan in order to check Russia, and to pronounce against the principle and practice of boycott in Asia? Who knows? Of this I feel convinced, as seen from Geneva, that in the world-life now played, Britain possesses the chief power of control.

5. If so, what of it?

(a) Britain must be held chiefly responsible for the out-put of the League, be that good or ill. This remark covers all acts of League organizations—Council, Assembly or Conference. Any measure that had hearty British backing would pass, given time. If Britain, for example, supported Russia's total disarmament plan, it would go through. One must keep his eye on India and Russia to interpret (official) British policy at Geneva. Britain has the chief power of control at Geneva, and must be held correspondingly responsible.

(b) Should America come into the League? I heard two lectures last week at the American Club declaring that we should. I am not yet persuaded, and have it under advisement. Here are some observations.

America would occupy a subordinate position. Washington cannot even telephone Geneva, except through England.

America is dull at diplomacy. It has been a profession for many decades in Europe. It does not fit American temperament.

The League is undemocratic. The Assembly has little real power, its acts being okayed by the Council.

The Council—the seat of power—is a House of Lords (14)—with five Big Powers being hereditary, and Britain most powerful. Further, the Council is an irresponsible body.

The Council's chief business is to administer the rich legacy left by the Versailles Treaty (mandates, etc.) most of it being property taken away from defeated nations, and to change national boundaries. I personally witnessed the painless transfer of the vast territory of Iraq from the mandate column to the column of independent nations — with Britain as godmother. I would prefer to have America keep out of that kind of legacy-business. She refused to go into the mandate-business 12 years ago, and I have always been glad. However, we did soil our hands with too much of the property of the defeated.

Would America be more useful for the peace of the world, if she were in or out of the League? Here, as the Scotchman said, I have an open mind, but have some doubts. I am inclined to think that, during the past six months, America has been a greater influence for peace, by being outside. If she had sat at that Council horseshoe table, she might have caught the same paralysis of tongue so marked in the Big Powers. Caution is contagious especially at tables where great stakes are involved. Stimson in Geneva, sitting next to Simon and Sato, would be less brave than Stimson, in Washington . . . I recall Wilson. He would have been more effective for world peace, if he had remained in Washington. So, it seems to me. Borah has more influence in the chancellories of Europe than any American statesman I know who may have breathed London's fog or shot grouse in Scotland.

Further, I am inclined to believe that mankind is safer in case the Big Powers are divided as now and an ocean apart. There may be unity that does not make for justice and well-being.

When I get out the map issued by the League, showing the countries of the world, the location of the mandates, etc., I am inclined to be glad that America is not sitting as a Big Power on the Council of Administration. And, this carries no "holier than thou" intimation.

The question remains, Should America join the League?

I regret that I shall go away from Geneva with the question unanswered.

It depends on how the *Committee of Nineteen* functions in the Asiatic tragedy centering on China.

It depends also on what the *Disarmament Conference* brings forth for the peace and stability of the world.

If these two creature-organizations of the League perform some noble acts, which carry the peoples of Japan, China, India up to greater heights of freedom and peace—if imperialism and plutocracy are shoved aside, and human relations first recognized—if I can discern the voices of Sun-Yat-Sen, Kagawa, Gandhi helping to shape the findings of the Committee and the Conference—I shall find it easy to go out and work for America getting into the League. I cannot forget the words of Jerome uttered in 1919, "The League of Nations will come when mankind has grasped the fact that Christ was the only practical statesman the world ever produced." If the League at this time shows real signs of aiming for the ideal, thousands would swiftly rush to its support.

But, if there is to come at this time around Shanghai the same old weary diplomacy—mingled militarism, imperialism, with procrastination—with brutal disregard of the masses—one would turn away in disappointment. The world is sick and tired from exploitation.

And now, Cousin John, let me be personal. As I have faithfully watched the wheels go round at Geneva, the chief, dominant power of control, this year, seems to be in your hand. The move is up to you!

SYDNEY STRONG.

Geneva, Switzerland.

P. S.—Later.

Just come (March 17) from a two hours session of the Committee of 19. Talk and act like the Council of 14! Merely five more who can walk around in a circle! Only have power to advise and watch—and advice is foggy. The Committee voted to take a vacation until after "the Easter holidays." Meanwhile, the Secretariat is to act in the capacity of Providence! . . . If I were China, I should cease putting my "trust in princes" and the League, and turn to the God of Sun-Yat-Sen and the People. Foreign domination of all kinds should be bowed out the Open Door. Good luck to you, China.

"Discourses on Religion Addressed to the Educated Among Its Despisers"*

This is the title of a book by Friedrich Schleiermacher which appeared in 1799. In this book Schleiermacher, undertakes to redefine the words of our religious vocabulary in such a way as to reinstate them in the estimation of those who had turned their backs upon religion. As the "Discourses" has been regarded by many as an epoch-making work, it is not inappropriate that we should devote a few minutes to its consideration today. I shall not, however, in my presentation confine myself to the language of the book but shall at times translate its thought into more modern terms.

The science of religion is not religion but theology just as the science of colors is not colors but chromatics. Colors are not science but subjective sensations. We may try to interpret these sensations and in so doing construct a science of chromatics with its theories of color vision. But these inferences are not the colors themselves and should our theories collapse, the colors would remain and would serve as a point of departure for a new and, let us hope, more durable interpretation.

In like manner religion is, for Schleiermacher, a subjective sensation. It is not a theory of God, nor a theory of truth nor a theory of conduct. It is a sensation which like the sense of color must be accepted as a fact. It may then be worked into a system of theology, but remains still quite independent of that system and should our system suddenly collapse, our religion would not be affected but remain, and serve as the point of departure for new systems of theology.

If we were to look out of the window, we would see many objects, a tree, a house, a flower and so forth and each of these objects produces in normal persons a sensation of color. If we were color blind this sensation would be absent. We would see the objects but they would not give us a color sensation. If we were religious persons we would see on looking out of the window objects which would or would not give us a color sensation depending on whether or not we were color-blind, but in any case they would give us, being religious persons, a religious sensation. To the religious man the contemplation of the cosmos or any part of it, "all that lives and moves . . . all growth and change . . . all doing and suffering," results in the religious sensation. Of the unreligious man, who does not get this sensation, we may say that he is God-blind.

Of course the "Discourses" do not use any such analogy as this. Color-blindness was not discovered until some years later but the analogy is, I think, both valid and illuminating.

Now what sort of feeling is this which is called religion? For Schleiermacher, it is the "sense of the whole." When looking at a finite object the unreligious man obtains only the impression of a finite object but when a religious man sees the same object he experiences it always as a fragment of a whole. The unreligious man may by careful reasoning come to the conclusion that the object is such a fragment but the religious man has no need of such reasoning for he feels at once in every object the property of fragmentariness. The unreligious man may discover or rather postulate an all inclusive unity which he may call Nature or by some other name, but the religious man feels at all times this unity which he calls God.

But how can this "sense of the whole" affect conduct? I think that I am not twisting Schleiermacher if I temporarily substitute for his "sense of the whole," the phrase *esprit de corps*. And so substituted the relation of the religious feeling to conduct is made clear at once.

Turning now to some other definitions, God is that whole of which we see only the fragments. The nature of God is a theological, not a religious, question. Revelation and prayer are states of heightened recognition of the fragmentariness of things. Grace is that which comes to us from objects which arouse in us the religious feeling.

*Vespers' address at Swarthmore College, March 20, 1932.

As for miracles, it is a mistake to define them as supernatural manifestations for this assumes that we can recognize the supernatural when we see it. But what was called supernatural yesterday is called natural today and what is called supernatural today may be called natural tomorrow, all depending on the advance of our knowledge. Thus to affirm the supernatural is to claim omniscience which is absurd. No, miracle is just the religious man's designation of an object or event. The unreligious man sees an object or an event as—well, just as an object or an event, but to the religious man all objects or events are miracles in that they cause wonder, admiration, awe, reverence.

I think that I have said enough to indicate to you the method and results of this book. And now I wish to make a few comments.

In the first place I wish to point out something which may or may not be a blemish depending on whether one is seeking harmony or clarity. Schleiermacher has retained old words but given them new content. The despisers of religion as defined by the Lutheran clergy of his day would at once rejoice in religion as defined by Schleiermacher. But will the followers of one definition feel kindly disposed towards the followers of the other definition merely because they both have come to call themselves religious? Not if they think clearly. But if they do not think at all, the common word may tend to promote harmony.

In our own day, also, the same process is going on. For example, the late G. B. Smith of the University of Chicago retained the old religious terminology but gave the words new meaning. He was bent, I suppose, on the training of Baptist ministers who would think modern thoughts in terms of the familiar symbols. In contrast to this, we have A. E. Haydon, also of the University of Chicago, who like M. C. Otto of the University of Wisconsin retains practically nothing of the old terminology. Their view is that everything must be sacrificed to clarity and that the use of old words with new meanings can only lead to intellectual confusion.

The second comment which I have to make is that Schleiermacher's method of defining religion is one which makes religion invulnerable to the attacks of science and scholarship. Religion is a feeling engendered by the perception of ordinary material things. This feeling is a fact based on facts in the scientific sense of the term. They are independent of science and yet they are the data of science. Science must reckon with them; it cannot ignore them, cannot deny them.

And now let us suppose that there are persons among us of the same type as those whom Schleiermacher was addressing. Let us turn our attention to these and let me speak to you for them.

We then who have turned our backs upon religion as conventionally defined are like every one else in this that we are seeking something relatively stable to tie to, something about which to integrate our lives.

If we are willing to accept Schleiermacher's method of selecting and enshrining something which is invulnerable, in the sense in which I have used the term, and yet do not quite like Schleiermacher's "sense of the whole," how may we redefine this word "religion" and, having found an acceptable definition, should we retain the word religion at all?

To take the second question first, I think that we should be very careful when we use the word religion that we are not deceiving anybody. But after what I have already said tonight, I think that there is no chance of my deceiving anybody here and so I shall retain the word religion for a little while longer.

What then shall be our religion?

If we make religion depend upon the recognition of an historic event, then we shall be in a bad way when some learned historian casts grave doubt upon its authenticity or devitalizes the event beyond all possible usefulness. Again if our definition involve the conception of an Absolute of any sort, we shall be enshrining an hypothesis the validity of which is daily called into question by philosophers and theologians of the first rank, which is, indeed, the center of a storm of controversy. Again if we say that science and scholarship have no part in these things but that our knowledge is immediate, then we shall stir up trouble with some, too many, of the psychologists and the students of comparative religions.

What then can be the subject of our canonization which will be at least relatively invulnerable to the attacks of science and scholarship?

Let us look about us at common every day things.

We have among us many who are thrilled by the word "friend"; we have groups of students in plenty who call themselves "brothers" or "sisters"; we have comrades too of one or two sorts; and we have fellowships as of social justice, reconciliation and so on.* Friendship, brotherliness, comradeship, fellowship. These are great things. No one can doubt their existence, nor their importance. May we not lump them all together calling the result altruism or love? May we not say that Love is our Religion? Is not Love worthy of canonization? And is not Love invulnerable in the sense in which I have been using this term?

But though Love is in a very real sense independent of science, there is a sense in which it is entirely dependent. Love's independence is not because it exists *in vacuo;* Love is too much a part of life for that. But even this fine feeling is of little import if it find no adequate expression. In this world grown so inconveniently complex, Love, though so independent of science in one sense, must seek aid from the scientific expert in order to express itself; it must go to the educator, to the health expert and especially at this time to the economist and social engineers.

Love then is my religion, is it? Well, now, I don't know. This same A. E. Haydon tells us,

Love is all right, but it is not religion. Religion is the social quest of the good life. This is not a postulate but an induction based on the study of the religions of all peoples in all times.

What am I to do about it? I can't contend with an expert on his own ground. Do I have to? No, I am not primarily interested in the definition of religion. I am interested in something to serve as a center of integration. Of all the things that seem to me worth while, Love is my first choice. And it does not really matter whether Love is or is not religion, it remains my first choice. Is it your first choice? It is certainly mine.

PERCY M. DAWSON.

---

*Note. I have not forgotten that we have also affection for our physical environment, the rocks, the mountains, lakes, cornfields, climbing ivy, the restless sea, the everchanging sky. These things play a r e as important to some people as their social environment. But all this belongs to another story.

The Study Table

A Jewish Elmer Gantry

After Sinclair Lewis's sensational caricature of the Christian minister in America as portrayed in his novel "Elmer Gantry," it was a matter of time only until someone would come along and try his hand at drawing that ecclesiastical scoundrel's counterpart in the rabbinate. But as to the book under review* coming any way near the power and force of the redoubtable Lewis, the less said about it the better. Here's the old time dramatic plot where the wicked schemer, this time stuffed into the sanctifying garb of the rabbi, shrewdly plots and executes his own sinister designs, and at the moment of triumph, attempts to carry off the gentle trusting maiden, his secretary, only to be confronted and unmasked at the end for the charlatan and impostor that he is.

From the opening scene of the book where we first meet Rabbi Burns launching a drive for his million dollar temple to the closing scene where we take leave of him—thank God—"shrugging his padded shoulders" in smug self-satisfaction as he walks out to his car—well pleased with himself at having scaled the financial heights in his new $20,000-a-year job—the portrayal is one long grotesque caricature. The descriptive jacket of the book misrepresents twice. First of all, this is no "novel" as claimed; at best, this is a potboiler on the same high plane of the serial love stories running daily in the tabloids, and with the same cesspool of sex incidents following one another methodically *ad-nauseam*. After all, what gives better promise of shaking down the prospective purchasers of books, than the prospect of seeing in juxtaposition, the puritanism of the holy wallowing in the mire of sensuousness and lasciviousness.

The author, a Jew, becomes as scurrilously unfair to his own people as he depicts the lust and sensuousness of the Jew, as did Ben Hecht in naming his erotic book "A Jew in Love." His art achieves such heights in realism as when he has the Christian girl call the would-be Jewish Hearst, Solon, "a cheap Jewish bastard" and later, "I never want to lay eyes on that kike again." This marks the lowest rung of the ladder of art, when compared or contrasted with the high tone in which Ludwig Lewisohn treats the relationship between Arthur and Elizabeth.

The protagonist of our story, Rabbi Burns, is hypocritical, ambitious, pretentious and ignorant but above all, determined and relentless—"everything he did, obeyed some powerful guiding law which had his own betterment for its goal." A Babbitt, worshipping material success after the manner of his own misguided congregants, he "dared not risk failure" for success was God's will. We follow this social climber from his starting place on the East Side, through an excuse for a rabbinical training at a seminary, and then on to a western pulpit which, in his publicity-seeking, the go-getting and self-seeking rabbi builds up into a million dollar temple, where he will cavort and hob-nob with the rich only, whom he would emulate. Adam, who pierces his deception, throws his hypocrisy in his face, "some get to the fat layer on top through real estate, others cloaks and suits. But you got there through God."

The ecclesiastical bogey presented for our annoyance is only one among the many of his temple-goers who are like him, in their pursuit of immediate, material rewards. Set over them to mould them along more spiritual ways, Burns, the religious leader, conveniently fits into the mould of his congregants. In the position of leader, he subtly becomes a follower of the herd and their pleasures. Dealing with a congregation of mediocrities, he a mediocrity himself, cannot rise any higher than they above the everyday class worldliness. "He got along with the men because he was practical with his spiritual business. A preacher who is burdened with too much religion, and preaches at right angles to his congregation, is a source of discomfort. Rabbi Burns knew that the sheep in his pasture wanted to be at ease." To Burns, religion "meant a form of entertainment. After all, the temple was not primarily a place of worship. It was a social center where credentials of wealth were far more important than religious ardor." The snobbery and petty divisions among the Jews themselves as satirized here is all to the good. "A beard or orthodoxy were sufficient to blackball a humble Jewish seeker in the perfumed place of worship."

Kandel assails the ignorance and dearth of spirituality in the high places of reform Judaism that feels the weight of his attack. The exposé that the author makes of this point—the danger of assimilation that the Jews in America face—constitutes a realistic appraisal of an imminent danger. Burns's congregants are confident that "the Jews will become assimilated and americanized." "Americans first, and then Jews" makes up the policy of the assimilationist, who is totally oblivious to the virtues and advantages of cultural pluralism. Burns himself abets this betrayal of his people's glorious heritage, in which the martyrs died reciting the *Shema* rather than surrender to apostasy and deny the One God.

The characters with whom the author surrounds the rabbi are true to life; here is some verisimilitude and artificial realism. There is Louis who, having never known the feeling of tradition — observing Judaism, arrives at a clear appreciation of it at his first contact with an Orthodox family, "It's a great feeling. You feel like you belong to something," exclaims Louis, as he sits down to the table with the lighted candles on it. Then there's the member of the Board of Trustees, business men and Babbitts, who vehemently object, "Are you trying to tell our rabbi his business. Dr. Burns knows religion, that's his business." Then there's Vivian, the rabbi's secretary, who romantically worships the rabbi whom she has set on a pedestal, only to become disillusioned and disenchanted when she finds him made of the same coarse clay as the rest. One who knows the rabbi observes,

> He (Burns) knows how to keep them interested, you know, there's always something lively going on in his Temple. And he makes a swell appearance among the *goyim*. He concentrates upon entertainment,—just as they do in the successful churches,—caters to his congregation and succeeds.

One woman temple-goer, observing the rabbi exhorting the congregation, remarks affectionately, "Look at our little rabbi, isn't he cute?" Or again later,

> there's our spiritual leader dancing like a West Point cadet. They must give courses in ballroom behavior at every modern seminary. It's part of the modern Rabbi's religious equipment.

*"Rabbi Burns," by Aben Kandel. Published by Covici Friede. $2.50.

The remark about religious equipment invites a review of certain of the points and parts in the preparatory stage of the rabbi's ministry to his congregation.

No sector of organized and institutional religion is more strategic and decisive than the preparatory seminary that has the responsibility of most carefully selecting the raw material that is to be whipped into shape, fit to shepherd the bewildered and leaderless flock of one's own people. In most other callings and professions the standards and qualifications are most exact and definite. The medical profession will seldom commit the error of sending forth one—to give battle to the physical diseases that man is heir to—who is inadequately prepared for the duties he will be called upon to perform. Shall the ecclesiastical profession rest content with a lower and more tenuous standard for those who are to minister to the spiritual needs of the people?

Looking at this caricature under review, "Rabbi Burns," after permitting all the sound and fury to die down, you can come upon a substratum of reality, indicated in this story. Though it is readily perceptible that the author fuses reality with unreality in this book, on removing the horns of the devil and the rest of the Satanic trimmings, there remains a semblance of truth. And that substratum is the pertinent query: just what qualities do and should go to make up the equipment of the religious leader? After all, this diatribe, this lampoon, is possible only because the author of the book must have in mind a few figures from real life that are a small edition and copy of this Jewish Tartuffe. The accusing finger is pointed at the lesser spirits, who are equipped—though to a smaller degree only—with some of the same weaknesses and cowardice that marks the protagonist of this story; mediocrity, ignorance and cupidity; real figures that are limited by the same lack of insight and independence of thought, and who gradually fit into the world of the men they are supposed to elevate and uplift.

The past has always witnessed the churches in their halcyonic days of temporal power and worldliness, attracting the literary onslaughts of the iconoclasts and blasphemists, of Voltaire, of Anatole France, of George Bernard Shaw and of Sinclair Lewis in our own social milieu. But Lewis hasn't dealt with *the* problem. It still remains for some one to pen the polemic that shall satirize the church and synagogue as they are entrenched in and aligned with our official economic system of capitalism, and its many ramifications from wage cuts and dividends to the issue of the whole labor movement. No American novelist has yet shown what should be revealed, which is the retreat and capitulation of the religionists in their blessing of war and their acceptance of our economic (im)morality, which they tacitly and insidiously sanction. Here is the occasion for photographic realism, but no novelist dares take up these sparkling issues, lest he burn his fingers. Why can't a novelist, like Dreiser or Lewis, be deadly serious with the vital issues of religion that are at stake, and portray the minister's perplexity and bewilderment in the specific issues of militarism and pacifism, of capitalism and socialism, of patriotism and internationalism.

Seeing what the seminaries should deal with and don't, in choosing their raw material, the query suggested by Kandel as to what they too often do deal with and shouldn't, in picking their candidates, becomes a pressing one. Is it at all possible that in the making of such grave decisions, anything like the following passes through the mind of the admitting executives?

"He's got the gift of gab, very good. A big, strapping fellow, he should go over big. Now, he mustn't be too *Jewish* looking, the Nordic looking fellow is preferable. And his mannerisms, they mustn't be too distinctly Jewish, neither must his speech have the faintest taint of the European intonation. Now, too Jewish a name, one that's hard to handle, won't do at all, it wouldn't fit in at all with our modern, Americanized Judaism. A good mixer, ah, that's the man, and his undergraduate marks, hm, a lot of A's, that marks the material we need."

I can't be sure that any such considerations—as those I have just conjectured—consciously and overtly enter into the selection of candidates for the rabbinate. But a few of the so-called finished products and of those who are still candidates for the responsible task of the rabbinate, are palpably such Babbitts and materialists, that one is compelled to deduce that considerations and whimsicalities as the above, may at times obscure the truer and more real qualifications of ethical passion and insight, social vision and individual courage, and the ability to actually *lead* men and not *trail* them.

There's no purpose calling Trafalgar 4050—one of the seminaries—and asking for Rabbi Burns. There's no such monstrosity in. But let all preparatory seminaries, Christian and Jewish, take heed lest they pass into their inner sanctum nonentities and mediocrities of this type.

NATHAN ESSELL.

Correspondence

A Personal Letter From India

Editor of UNITY:

Events have fully corroborated my remarks in my last letter of 27th November 1931. I wrote, "When he returns to India Gandhi will find it impossible to stay his hands even if he wants to," and in fact Gandhiji had only seven days of freedom in India. The whole ground was laid out before he landed at Bombay. Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan Saheb, popularly known as 'the Frontier-Gandhi,' Pundit Krishnakant Malviya, the son of Pundit Madanmohan Malviya, Sjt Purshottamdas Tandon, the president of Lala Lajpat Rai's Servants of the People Society and many other popular and prominent leaders were placed behind iron bars when Gandhiji was still on his way. When he landed at Bombay he missed not only many dear comrades of his but he found that Bengal, United Provinces and the Frontier Provinces were actually under a veiled Martial Law. He knew that by arresting his compatriots and by issuing the ordinances only a week before his arrival the bureaucracy meant war. But peace-loving as he is, he wired to the Viceroy beseeching him for his guidance and an audience. But with a snub and a sneer he and his associates were arrested even while his third wire was still on its way. I presume that you are well aware of the full text of the wires and that you must have by now formed your judgments. I hope you will agree with me if I say that with startling impatience the government has declared war on the Con-

gress. It would be untrue this time to say that the congress has precipitated the crisis. The government has in fact taken the offensive and with a vengeance they mean to crush the congress. In their brutal, barbarous, beastly way they have set the whole machine of persecution into full operation and they are out to crush everything just and upright. The parade of the jack-boots and the iron hand has begun.

Following upon the arrest of their leader the people were presented with four ordinances which are the very masterpieces of vagueness and venom. There exists no liberty of person or property under these new fiats. A person can be arrested on mere suspicion and can be sent to custody without trial. No warrant is needed to effect an arrest, nor any law to ban the payment of any money lying in a bank. The very name of the congress is sufficient to endanger any man or money. The congress funds are to be confiscated, the congress buildings are to be occupied by the military, the congress men are to be jailed and even the congress flag and the congress news are to be unlawful. You can not speak of a congress procession or a congress meeting without endangering your liberty, and this while the congress strictly enjoins upon every member to be non-violent and truthful. We are living under a black regime of repression and all my knowledge of history does not tell me of a parallel to this terrorism. Now in this country there is neither freedom of thought nor action. In hundreds Congress and allied bodies are declared unlawful, in hundreds people are sent to jail, in hundreds the congress moneys are confiscated.

You may take it a very conservative estimate when I state that this time more than a million people are prepared to face the jails; you may take it a very conservative estimate when I state that this time several thousands are prepared to face the bullets; and that the government has not the means to keep even one tenth of them behind their bars. The government has therefore discarded all pretences to abide by the rules of the game, as the popular idiom goes, and has taken to purely brutal methods of flogging those who join in any congress demonstration. Gandhiji has well-nigh won so far as the principle of Civil Disobedience goes, but at that the government may claim the victory so far as its practical results go. I find it rather impossible to describe in words what the lathi charges mean, but you may take them as revolting to the very flesh. I fear therefore that Gandhiji may be unsuccessful in giving shape to his excellent doctrine as a means to a great objective. Gandhiji will fail not because his method is defective or miscalculated but because he is fighting not against men but against devils. We must remember that civil disobedience means that we must face consequences that can be lawfully inflicted upon us. But when the authorities forget all laws and simply employ revolting methods, there is an end to all peaceful protests.

There is a limit to the power to suffer. Individuals like Mahatma Gandhi may lay down their lives peacefully crushed by jack-boots and lathi charges, but in the case of the multitude the very fact that they have come to the very end of all worldly misery will set them in a mad revolt against the oppressor; and the fact that they are in the right gives them a vigor which can be quelled only by victory. The British government has now in its dealings with the people of India touched the point when the Indian people can bear their oppressions no longer. For peaceful activities Indians have been clubbed to the point of fainting. For peaceful activities Indians have been beaten to death. I know of no other people except mine own who can contain themselves in the face of these cold-blooded brutalities and murders of their dear ones at the hands of those who are after all foreigners. The Indian people are prepared to go to jails for disobeying the laws, but they can not and will not tolerate the brutalities of the lathi charges. The government, instead of sending the civil resisters to the jails is sending them to the hospitals and even throwing them on the roads to rot like dogs. *The Indian people would rather follow any ill-considered and mad policy than wilfully go the path which is visibly strewn with all the horrors and shocks that flesh is heir to.* They would rather face bullets than lathis. Lathi charges are something worse than death, it is torture within life, it brings all the pains of hell on earth.

So far I have always written to you as a believer in non-violence, but I regret to say today I am skeptic. Not that I believe that non-violence in the abstract is bad or impossible but what I mean is that possibly India is not the place where the great experiment will be carried out successfully. In forming this opinion I know that I have possibly erred somewhere but in spite of all my head-scratchings I have not been able to find out where I have gone wrong or how. Somehow I even feel confident that my views are shared by some among my countrymen and I think, rightly or wrongly, among your countrymen as well. I would therefore like to know whether you can agree with what I have written and more particularly with what follows.

In our dealings with our fellowmen, in our dealings with our so-called "lower brethren." I do believe in the potency of non-violence, but I think it would be mid-summer madness to talk of any such thing when we are facing a ferocious wild beast or a green cobra. I think events in India show beyond the shadow of a doubt that we are facing not misguided human beings but wild beasts who have been accustomed to our blood by the rub of the bureaucratic machine and that to talk of non-violence to them is like casting pearls before swine. If ever India has the misfortune of reverting from the path of non-violence it is because above all she realizes that she is dealing with animals who in their barbarity have put even brutes to shame and we draw our consolation in the words of Mahatma Gandhi when he said: "I would welcome bloodshed, anarchy, anything, rather than this rule."

I hold that the attainment of freedom is impossible in this country by peaceful means. The Indian people have been in these few days terrorized as they had never been before. They have been the recipients of tortures which would make even the hearers' blood boil with indignation. Lathis have so shocked them that they have chosen to be cowards. Their activities have been crushed, their voices have been silenced, and even their bitter sobs of agony are not allowed to be heard even by their own countrymen. There has been a complete suppression of news, there has been a rigorous cutting off of communications and cities are living in virtual isolation. *Not till the nations of the world cease to keep mum on the tortures inflicted by a nation on a nation can non-violence succeed.* If ever the non-violent experiment is to succeed India must have the active co-operation of a world power; or else England's difficulty shall be India's opportunity. Just as the last World War gave liberty to many aspiring nations, so will the next one bestow its blessings on India: let the pacifists say what they will. If war is to be abolished, if peace is to be established it must be a healthy peace, not the peace of the grave-yard. We yield to no one in our love for the No-War movement, but we are not prepared to compromise our natural right to our natural liberty.

Ahmedabad, India

N.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 98)

ment was possible, while at the same time such ordinances could go into force.

There was no failure of any kind in co-operation when Gandhi went back, but the Government knew that if the Ordinances in Bengal were continued in force in the character they then possessed, the public opinion of the whole of the Congress would make it impossible for Gandhi to continue as a member of the Round Table Committees because these ordinances in Bengal (and it is only of these that I am speaking) were intended to emasculate and would emasculate the life of a whole province and what Mr. MacDonald was asked to consider was amendments, the justification of which was beyond doubt; that no one could be put to death without appeal to the Privy Council of this country; and that all punishments inflicted by special tribunals in India should be reviewed by the Viceroy in India. Does anyone who remembers Amritsar consider that an impossible demand? And the third thing that Sapru and his friends were suggesting as an amendment was that collective punishment of villages where an assassin might have been hidden should not be imposed, because it is unjust that the innocent should be included with the guilty in the infliction of punishment. Had these amendments been discussed

in the belief that they would have been adopted in India the continuance of relations with Gandhi would have been possible now. But the Government of India decided the contrary; they decided on the basis of a letter from Mr. Gandhi not perhaps couched in the happiest of terms. The Viceroy took the view that this was equivalent to breaking off relations.

Nothing is more clear than that a Government that is not willing to discuss is bound to oppress and I cannot avoid the conclusion that above all the civil servants of India had come to the conclusion that there was a danger of the Round Table Conference succeeding and that their own power would be taken away and that they saw a possibility of one last grand hour of glorious life and that they took the opportunity of remaining true to the traditions characteristic of their past.

Then what does the British Government hope to achieve? We understand that there are twenty thousand people in jail. What makes a policy successful? Is it some special figure at the attainment of which we can know that success has been attained? Does the Government think that by lathi charges and firing it can crush the spirit of a whole people? It did not crush it more than 150 years ago in South Africa. It has never been the history of coercion. You can win for a short time but over a long period where violence is unassociated with right the fatality that depends on a policy of violence is fatal to the end you seek to pursue. We all know the ultimate outcome. They may succeed today and tomorrow. There will come a day when the mob or the police or the troops will get out of hand and we shall have another Amritsar and then we shall abandon through our sense of shame a policy of repression and take up the process of negotiation. Sooner or later the Government must discuss this matter with Gandhiji. Why not today instead of tomorrow? Let us take it at its very best. Let us assume that the Government is able to maintain its policy of coercion until some kind of agreement is reached in Delhi and London and some form of responsible government is put on a statute book. Elections will be held; Gandhi will sweep the elections and the Viceroy (perhaps Mr. Ramsay MacDonald) will have to deal with the Congress inevitably embittered to this country, and our last stage will be worse than the first.

I cannot understand what the British Government hopes to obtain. I know that it is magnificent to be able to turn round to the present House of Commons and say "There you are, see what a strong mind and grim determination can do with violence." I am always inclined to rely on authority and we have Mr. Gladstone's authority that the people of India are exactly like the people of England. I remember that in the days of women's suffrage when we were asking for the vote for women and the right for them to share in the government of the country, we used to question the admirable remark of Mr. Gladstone that when the people are silent they are content. When people of India met quietly and passed resolutions the British Government paid no attention to the resolutions, but when the people of India began to pursue the policy of non-co-operation then the English people began to feel that the time had come to listen and then the second stage arrived when the Indian people said that they had had enough. The English people insist that they will not yield to disorder.

My view of the elements of this problem is one very different from Sir Samuel Hoare's and his colleagues'. I do not deny the difficulties of devising an effective scheme for self-government for India. It is not a matter to be put into operation in a day. It is going to be a long, difficult and arduous adventure, and any one who believes that India can be made wholly and completely free and will be able to manipulate her freedom to manage self-government fully is blinding his eyes to the difficulties. It is not merely the problem of the Hindus and Moslems but the case of the poverty on one side and the Princes on the other. The day of reckoning for the poor is still to come. Indian nationalism is a poison which affects every part of the people of India so that they cannot bind themselves to the construction of that issue, the poverty of the poor, and until they are given self-government and can tackle the question of land owners and mill owners in the way in which I hope we shall one day tackle similar problems in this country they cannot get to the root of the problems involved.

The questions I wish Mr. MacDonald and Sir S. Hoare would reflect upon are these. I do not doubt that it is in the power of the Government of this country to make the people of India miserable. I want to inquire whether it is not to their interest to make them happy. I agree that they can by the application of military force make it appear as though for some time the Congress has been crushed. There is a theory of Burke's that "great Empires and little minds go ill together" and it seems not unlikely that what there is of good we shall destroy by pettiness and narrowness of outlook.

I urge this attitude of emancipation not only for the sake of India but for our own. I am ashamed for my partial responsibility for a policy such as this. I cannot forget that the whole case against democratic government in England in the 19th century was made by men returned from India who were intolerant of our intolerant ways. I do not believe that we can co-operate in an adventure which suppresses human personality without becoming indifferent to the suppression of our own freedom.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE
Subscription Price $1.50 Per Year

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
3 Months
— 13 —
ISSUES
20c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 20 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper. The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The March-April issue of
The New Humanist

Articles

THE LOST INDIVIDUAL
by James H. Hart

GOD AND MODERN SCIENCE
by Maynard Shipley

THE ALTERNATIVE TO WAR
by John S. Moore

THE RELIGION OF D. H. LAWRENCE
by John Hawley Roberts

DISSENTING OPINION ON SHAW
by Alexander P. Cappon

BOOK REVIEWS
by Curtis W. Reese, Raymond B. Bragg, Robert J. Hutcheon, Robert S. Loring, Edwin Fairley and others.

SPECIAL OFFER

The New Humanist ($1.00 *yearly;* 20c *a copy) will be sent in combination with any of the following books at reduced prices (regular price of book in brackets) The New Humanist for one year*

With: Sir James Jeans "The Mysterious Universe" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: Norman Thomas, "As I See It" ($2.00) $2.50
With Twenty-two Authors "Living Philosophies" ($2.50)—$2.75
With: Curtis Reese "Humanist Religion" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: A. E. Haydon "The Quest of the Ages" ($2.50)—$8.00
With: Walter Lippmann "A Preface to Morals" ($1.00)—$1.65

If book you want is not listed here, send for prices. Please send check or money order, otherwise books will be mailed C. O. D. All orders must be placed with

THE NEW HUMANIST
14 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio